

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/579,777

Applicant(s)

ISHIKAWA, HIRAKU

Examiner

Shamim Ahmed

Art Unit

1792

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Shamim Ahmed.

(3) _____

(2) Asaf Batelman.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 July 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: Yuda et al (6,663,715).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discusses the differences between the prior art and the instant invention, specifically, Yuda fails to teach that the plasma excitation gas supply is not at the lower side of the high frequency wave supply unit side and also agree to consider upon filing official response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Shamim Ahmed/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792